

09/967,228

REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3-8, 10-11 AND 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-8, 10-11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the Hunt reference ("Automatic Identification of Spoken Names and Addresses", undated, hereinafter "Hunt"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In particular, the Applicants submit that Hunt is not proper prior art against Applicants' application. As Hunt does not provide a publication date, it cannot be relied upon as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) (MPEP 2128). Moreover, slide 36 of Hunt indicates that Novauris, the owner of the technology described in Hunt, was founded in March 2002. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that it is unlikely that Hunt was published before March 2002 at the earliest. As Applicants filed the present application on September 28, 2001, it is respectfully submitted that the present application predates the publication date of Hunt by no less than approximately four months. As such, the Applicants submit that Hunt can not properly be used to support a rejection of the Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Therefore, the Applicants submit claims 1, 3-8, 10-11 and 17 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are patentable thereunder.

II. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 12 -13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed, independent claims 1 and 10, from which claims 2 and 12-13 depend, are patentable over Hunt because Hunt is not proper prior art against Applicants' application. As such, the Applicants submit that Hunt can not properly be

09/967,228

used to support a rejection of the Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, the Applicants submit claims 2 and 12-13 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

III. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants thank the Examiner for her comments regarding the allowability of claim 9 and of claims 14-16, if rewritten in independent form. However, in light of the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-16, as they stand, are presently in allowable form.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of the presented claims fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

7/27/05
Date

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

Respectfully submitted,

Diana J. Rea
Diana J. Rea, Esq.
Reg. No. 54,938
(732) 530-9404